



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,394	02/27/2004	Tomohiko Matsushita	15115.108001	4933

7590 12/14/2005
Jonathan P. Osha
Rosenthal & Osha L.L.P.
Suite 2800
1221 McKinney St.
Houston, TX 77010

EXAMINER

VU, PHU

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ikeda
US 20030016323.**

Regarding claims 1-2 Ikeda teaches a reflector used for a liquid crystal display device, the reflector comprising: a substrate (10), a plurality of unit regions on an external light facing surface or a back surface of the substrate (see fig. 10), the reference also teaches the limitation of "a plurality of unit reflecting portions disposed on each of the plurality of unit regions, the disposed plurality of unit reflective portions being of random size within each of the plurality of unit regions, each of the plurality of unit regions having a common arrangement pattern of the plurality of unit reflective portions and wherein the repetition pitch of the unit regions is integral times the pitch of the pixels the liquid crystal display device and more than 5000 microns." Considering a region denoted by P as a sub-unit region (see figure 10) than the unit reflective portions

comprise of random sizes (see individual reflectors in figure 10). Therefore the repetition pitch of the unit regions is arbitrary as a single "unit region" can be considered comprise several sub-unit regions such that a single unit region has a repetition pitch of more than 1000 micrometers or 5000 micrometers. Applicant's limitation of unit reflective portions does not impose any specific structure on the grouping of unit reflectors or what exactly comprises the unit region therefore, interpreting the unit region as an arbitrary grouping of unit reflective portions to meet the limitation of 1000 or 5000 micrometer repetition pitch these limitations are met.

Regarding claim 3, Ikeda teaches this limitation as the limitation of "a circumscribed circle" does not apply any structure as the projection of an arbitrarily defined circumscribed circle can be less than 80 micrometers. Since applicant does not set for any requirements for the circle projection or how the projection defines any structure this limitation is met.

Regarding claim 4, the limitation of a circumscribed circle sets forth no limitations therefore a circumscribed circle can mean any circle therefore considering the circumscribed circles to have equal diameters meets this limitation as then the standard deviation would be less than one.

Regarding claim 5, Ikeda teaches the reflector according to claim 1 reflecting externally entering light thereby displaying an image (see fig. 10)

Regarding claim 6, Ikeda teaches and LCD including the reflective display device according to claim 5, which is an electronic apparatus (see fig. 10).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu Vu whose telephone number is (571)-272-1562. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on (571)-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2871

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phu Vu
Examiner
AU 2871


ANDREW SCHECHTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER